

Re Box No. VIII.

- 1 The application does not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT, because claim 10 is not clear. Although claim 10 includes a reference back to claim 1, it is not clear whether the multiple injection is a technical feature of the apparatus or not. In particular in combination with claim 11, the impression is created that the multiple injection is not necessarily part of the invention. This creates an inconsistency between claim 1 and claim 10 and consequently a lack of clarity about the essential technical features of the invention.

The description also contains passages which contradict claim 1 by mentioning the possibility of a single injection (see, for example, page 6, lines 24-31) and so create a lack of clarity within the meaning of Article 6 PCT.

Re Box No. V.

- 1 In the present opinion, reference is made to the following documents:
D1: DE 101 54 974 A (VOLKSWAGENWERK AG) 15 May 2003 (2003-05-15)
D2: US 6 345 499 B1 (ARAKI KEIJI ET AL) 12 February 2002 (2002-02-12)
- 2 Document D1 is regarded as the nearest prior art. It discloses (the references in brackets relate to this document):
a method for controlling the transition between a normal mode of operation and a mode of operation using coasting for an internal combustion engine driven by direct fuel injection, wherein the ignition angle is retarded in order to avoid a torque jump.

The subject matter of the independent claim 1 differs therefrom in that, in order to reduce the torque jump further, fuel is injected into a cylinder of the Otto engine in the form of a multiple injection, with at least a partial quantity of the fuel requiring to be injected being deposited during the compression phase.

- 2.1 The subject matter of claim 1 is therefore novel (Article 33 (2) PCT).
The object to be achieved by the present invention can therefore be seen to consist in realizing a further reduction in the torque jump while preserving the stability of the combustion.

2.2 The use of such a multiple injection method for reducing torque is neither known from the rest of the prior art nor made obvious by it. Multiple injections in combination with a retardation of the ignition angle are in fact known for the purpose of increasing the exhaust gas temperature (see, for example, D2), but there are no indications that would prompt the person skilled in the art to apply this knowledge to a method for reducing torque.

The solution proposed for this problem in claim 1 of the present application is therefore based on an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT):

2.3 Claims 2-9 are dependent on claim 1 and therefore also meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and inventive step.

3 Assuming that the multiple injection is part of the subject matter of claim 10, the arguments put forward for claim 1 also apply to claim 10.

3.1 Claim 11 is dependent on claim 10 and therefore also meets the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and inventive step.